## Intro

#### It is 35 mins before round 6 at Emory’s Barkley Forum debate tournament. You are neg versus Grady AB you look at the pairing and you see the judge is Adrian Veidt and you check the wiki and see the plan is as followed “Resolved: WE CALL TO AFFIRM AFRO ASIA AS A DISCURSIVE METHOD OF UNITING THE BLACK AND ASIATIC WORLDS IN THE COLLECTIVE RESISTANCE AGAINST WHITE SUPREMACY.” What arguments would you read?

#### Now you read the judging philosophy and it reads…

Adrian Veidt. Policy Debate

Coaching Affiliation: Ozymandias Community High School 2010-Current

Alumni: University of Watchmen 2006

I’ll try to make this as short as possible:

Let's say what not to do first:

Counter plans are counterproductive, it'd be in your best interest not to run this in front of me. I strongly advise against it because I don't like the theory debate that comes with it and I don't want to hear case vs. case (net benefit)

I'd also prefer if you didn't run framework because I've had enough experience in debate that I don't need to hear a whole tournament of how I should frame debates. FW shouldn't be your default but a last resort.

I'd rather just hear case, kritiks

Base on the judging philosophy what arguments would you read? Would you still read a CP or Polx or FWK?

## Aff

### OBSERVATION ONE: THE RACIAL REALITY OF AFRO ASIAN RELATIONS

**From the dawn of America’s founding, African-Americans and Asians have become ALLIES in a common resistance against RACIAL EXPLOITATION. From the REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT of DuBois, Malcolm X, and the Black Panthers, to the RADICAL RESISTANCE of Ho Chi Minh, Mao Zedong, and Yuri Kochiyama, an interlocking relationship of the BLACK and ASIATIC worlds was created.**

**For TWO CENTURIES, blacks and Asians have sustained a tradition of COLLABORATIVE and RADICAL political and cultural connections that are UNDOCUMENTED in the literature of the West. United by RACIAL EXPLOITATION, OPPRESSION and collective RESISTANCE, the untold relationship created by blacks and Asians, once INEXORABLE, has become lost in modern literature.**

**The “abolition” of slavery gave rise to the trade of Asiatic coolies, which brought Asian laborers to the same plantation societies as the African slaves, often on the SAME ships that had transported those captured Africans. The diasporic experience and shared traditions of RESISTANCE and STRUGGLE have created a space for liberation and equality.**

**Despite the INTERCONNECTED revolutionary liberation tactics and the HISTORY of COLLABORATION and ENGAGEMENT between the black and Asian populations of the U.S. and China, federal government-instituted policies have constructed TENSION between the two identities where none existed. This allowed the account of narratives and collective resistance of anti-blackness and orientalism to be LOST in the emancipation struggle.**

Mullen & Ho 08 [Bill V. Mullen is the Professor of English and American Studies @ Purdue and teaches courses in African American Literature and Culture; Fred Ho is a political activist and the founder and bandleader of the Afro Asian Music Ensemble; Afro Asia: Revolutionary Political and Cultural Connections between African Americans and Asian Americans, pp. 6-8; REJ]

The African American radical and revolutionary movement has, since its explosion, suffered assassination, incarceration, and calumny. The expansion of the black middle class has been one of the most significant gains won from the hard-fought civil rights and Black Power struggles. As concessions and response to revolutionary demands for full equality and empowerment, federal government–instituted policies and programs such as affirmative action recruitment and hiring were instituted. The expansion of a black elite beholden to government and corporate admittance has spawned a reformist and neoconservative black leadership, often in direct consequence and designed to supplant the black Left. The appointment of Clarence Thomas to the U.S. Supreme Court, and the rise of neoconservative black ideologues such as Thomas Sowell, Shelby Steele, Clarence Pendleton, Stanley Crouch, Alan Keyes, and others, reflect a new generation of media pundits who support the neoconservative agenda of minimizing or erasing racism and the saliency of race by attacking special programs and supporting the overall drumbeat of U.S. imperialism. Along with the rise of black neoconservatives, which is the direct political and intellectual wing of black franchise capitalism, is the rise of an essentialist black fundamentalism, articulated in part as Afrocentrism and represented by Louis Farrakhan and Molefi Asante. Another very influential sector, based primarily in academia and in intellectual power, is an integrationist celebrity strata with well-known and well-paid intellectuals. Many of the neoconservatives, along with their counterparts in the Afrocentrist sphere, have promoted an attitude of black protectionism for the small gains secured by these middle classes. A ‘‘black versus other minorities’’ endgame has been constructed in the competition for status, resources, and token power, reflected in debates and divisions between Afrocentrism versus multiculturalism and between the black community as consumer versus the Korean or Asian merchant as outside parasites. What is also noteworthy is that within the African American community, cleavages, fault lines, contradictions, and conflicts are also promulgated and fanned by both neoconservatives and black essentialist- fundamentalists—namely, black men versus black feminism and self-responsibility versus blaming the system and racism, as well as the rise of variants of black masculinist capitalism. In the maintenance of ruling power, the tactic of divide and conquer has been very effective especially in conditions of limited and narrow political consciousness on the part of the oppressed. Between Africans and Asians in the United States, divisions are accentuated through competition over resources and positioning vis-à-vis the institutional funding troughs in vastly dissimilar terrains ranging from colleges and universities to inner-city ghettos. The concessions such as ethnic studies programs or minority affairs offices or student cultural centers are increasingly embracing isolationism and protectionism in a defensive circle-the-wagons mentality for the small, hard-won gains on college campuses. The dramatic increases in the Latino and Asian/Pacific student presence has intensified competition over limited student government and administration funds and support for these programs. Pressure to reallocate funds, once perceived as black entitlements and preserves, to be shared with ‘‘other’’ minorities has fueled resentment and suspicion on the part of African Americans. The history of collaboration and common struggle that brought about these concessions in the first place is often ‘‘lost’’ or ‘‘forgotten’’ as demagogues from both black and other minorities vie for most-favored minority status with the dominant administration.

**BEYOND the LOST IDENTITIES and RELATIONS between the blacks and Chinese in the U.S. and China, racism, anti-blackness, and orientalism have TRANSCENDED national borders and are now exported globally, especially between the political institutions of the Western world and China.**

Goldberg 11 [David Theo; Director of the University of California Humanities Research Institute, Formerly Director and Professor of the School of Justice Studies at Arizona State University; \*Frank Dikötter is Chair Professor of Humanities at the University of Hong Kong and Professor of the Modern History of China, he has published a trilogy on racism, sexism and eugenics in modern China; A Companion to Comparative Literature Ch. 22 — The Comparative and the Relational: Meditations on Racial Method, pp. 360-363, REJ]

In a recent discussion piece for Ethnic and Racial Studies, Frank Dikötter at first looks like he is concerned to develop something like a relational account. He dismisses standard accounts of racism as trading on understanding it “as a uniform phenomenon, as if there were only one form of universal in its origins, causes, meanings and effects.” By contrast, he insists, racisms are not “fixed or static entities” but “interactive,” taking “appropriation, differential usage and re-signification as key to understanding the rapid spread of racist worldviews in parts of the world outside Europe ” (Dikötter, 2008 : p. 1482). Dikötter at least points in the right direction. Although he starts out well he all too quickly seems to choose the culdesac fork in the road. His account bogs down in an argument for recognizing the unique national traditions of racist articulation in areas of the world outside of Europe, such as Japan, China and parts of West Africa. Far from enabling a robust relational account, Dikötter’s is an “interactionism” among already constituted discrete national configurations, suggesting perversely exactly the sort of universalism of racisms he claims to reject. “[P]eople across all continents,” he concludes, “express profound interest in the outward appearance of people and are likely to divide people along some sort of racial classification, “white” and “black” being poles now adopted almost everywhere. ” Indeed, he even gives title to this: “the racialization of the globe,” from “Latin America to East Asia ” (Dik ö tter, 2008 : p. 1494). By contrast, the relational account I’m suggesting takes leave from this universalizing of racial naturalization bound to finding color prejudice recurrent from Latin America to East Asia. Racial relationality turns by contrast on two interactive claims. Dikötter loosely recognizes the first, only to pull back from its development and ignore its implications. In the first instance, racial ideas, meanings, exclusionary and repressive practices in one place are influenced, shaped by, and fuel those elsewhere. Racial ideas and arrangements circulate, cross borders, shore up existing or prompt new ones as they move between established political institutions. Gayatri Spivak characterizes something like this in literature as “uneven permeability,” and the notion reflects the movements and impacts at work here (Spivak, 2003 : p. 17). Ideas and practices emanating from elsewhere are made local; local practices that appear homegrown more often than not have a genealogy at least in part not simply limited to the local. The local may provide a particular timbre and color to the ideas’ reference or application, their sound and style. It gives voice to racial expression and racist arrangement in specific ways. But while the accent may be unique, as too the semantic content and even the syntax, their influences and implications most often are not. Who counts as “black” and who “white” differs from one place to another, as too do specific meanings attached to the designations and their placements. Nonetheless, in the broad, their relational conditions – to each other as concepts, to the pragmatics of those concepts wherever in use – strongly suggest that, once so designated and determined, conditions of privilege and disprivilege, power and vulnerability will pertain. Second, racist arrangements anywhere – in any place – depend to a smaller or larger degree on racist practice most everywhere else. Absent racist institutionalization most everywhere else local (at least in every place marked by modernity) racist expression, if not disposition, would certainly be less resonant and impactful, if not (quite) cease in significance altogether. The support racial thinking and racism “ here ” gets from “ there ” – both as a symbolic matter and materially – sustains and extends the impacts. This, in short, might better be characterized as the globalization of the racial than the racialization of the globe. The globalization of the racial is predicated on the understanding that racial thinking and its resonances circulated by boat in the European voyages of discovery, imported into the impact zones of colonization and imperial expansion. Racial ordering, racist institutional arrangement, and racial control were key instruments of colonial governmentality and control. Made local to apply to lived conditions of the everyday, the colonies became in turn sites of state experimentation, as Bernard Cohn long argued (Cohn, 1996 ), laboratories for metropolitan class rule, the maintenance of order, rehearsals in the intimacies and morals of class life (Stoler, 2003, 2006 ). Re - imported as the baggage of colonial administrators and the “ return ” of the imperial repressed of colonial charge, strands of racial governmentality seeped into, ordered if not colonized also the imaginations of metropolitan burghers. The racial out there came, by extension and connection, default and design, to shape home rule, if with local specificity. Cohn insisted that “ the metropole and colony have to be seen in a unitary field of analysis ” (Cohn, 1996 : p. 4). I am urging, by extension, that this unitary field of analysis is deeply if differentially, heterogeneously, relational.

**The discursive performance of the 1AC is the dialectical enactment of scholarship to expose the functioning of whiteness erasing Afro-Asian relations and make VISIBLE the true alliance and collective struggle against white supremacy.**

Afro Asia solidary has become DIRE in the height of radical and anti-imperialistic leadership, political consciousness has been LOST, escalating the tragedy of sensationalized violence between blacks and Asians. These conditions of violence have LOWERED CONSCIOUSNESS and allowed for the rise of NATIONALISM and the destruction of SUBVERSION by the United States.

Afro-Asia solidarity seeks to FIGHT, COUNTER, and RESIST the faded consciousness and create the relationship to create political and cultural resistance against oppression the black and Chinese body and DEVALUATION of Afro-Asian collaboration. The dialectical insertion of scholarship in the 1AC is not only CRITICAL to create the consciousness to diplomatically engage and restore Afro-Asian relations, but is an attempt to contribute to challenge POLITICAL and CULTURAL connections developed by blacks and Chinese in an attempt to CONFRONT white supremacy and global oppression.

Mullen & Ho 08 [Bill V. Mullen is the Professor of English and American Studies @ Purdue and teaches courses in African American Literature and Culture; Fred Ho is a political activist and the founder and bandleader of the Afro Asian Music Ensemble; Afro Asia: Revolutionary Political and Cultural Connections between African Americans and Asian Americans, pp. 13-16; REJ]

The urgency for greater Afro Asia solidarity and the general elevation of radical, anti-imperialist leadership and political consciousness has become dire with the escalating tragedy of sensationalized racist violence between Asians and blacks. **In recent years in New York City, there has been a series of killings of Chinese restaurant takeout-delivery workers—all with alleged and arrested black perpetrators. Four Chinese delivery workers in the last five years have been brutally murdered, all in predominantly black areas.** The killings include Jian Lin Chun, killed in the lobby of a Bedford- Stuyvesant building on October 15, 2002; Golden Wok restaurant owner Jin-Sheng Liu, killed on Sept. 1, 2000, in St. Albans while making a delivery; Ng Cheung Cheung, beaten to death by a baseball bat in Jamaica on June 23, 1999; Li-Rong Lin, repeatedly stabbed to death on December 10, 1998, in Hollis while delivering from the China Buffet restaurant; and, most recently, Huang Chen, killed in South Jamaica on April 30, 2004, where an investigation resulted in the arrest of two African American teens. In the last example, the New York Post reported the incident as an example of ‘‘Chink-bashing’’ and characterized such violence as a new ‘‘urban sport’’ of premeditated assaults committed largely by black youth upon Chinese delivery ‘‘boys’’ (though in typical New York Post racism the majority of these ‘‘boys’’ are men over the age of forty, as Chinese men are still desexualized and belittled as perpetual adolescents incapable of being ‘‘real men’’ as compared to white men). **This condition of narrowed and lowered consciousness has allowed for the rise of narrow nationalism and ethnic economic protectionism, paralleling the rise of religious fundamentalism and extreme protonationalism from the destruction and subversion by the United States of independent democratic and leftist movements and governments globally. The rise of black neoconservativism, masculinist black capitalism, black petty-bourgeois protectionism, etc. could only occur with the suppression and dismantling of the radical and revolutionary forces that emerged and held dominance during the late 1960s and early 1970s as well as U.S. governmental, corporate, and academic promotion of a reformist and reactionary elite.** Gone are mass slogans and popular cultural concepts such as anti- imperialist Third World unity. Instead, pro-blackness has increasingly taken on a form of essentialist, narrow, reformist black capitalism that reflects the general nihilism, cynicism, self-gratification, and solipsism of the pro- Yankee imperialist New World Order and Mass Consumer Plantation culture and society. **This anthology seeks to fight, counter, resist, and attack this condition by illuminating a tradition of creative political and cultural resistance grounded in Afro-Asian collaboration and connectivity.** We, **the editors of this anthology**, have created a hybrid collection of scholarly and testimonial essays along with creative writings, and we hope to bridge academic and scholarly interest with a popular readership—in other words, to **provide a tool that can be useful for and supportive of building Afro Asian unity, solidarity, and common struggle. In doing so we extend the work of scholars whose writing has focused important attention to the dynamics of Afro Asian exchange.** This work includes the aforementioned important books The Karma of Brown Folk and Everybody Was Kung Fu Fighting by Vijay Prashad; Mark Gallichio’s The African American Encounter with Japan and China: Black Internationalism in Asia, 1895–1945; Martin Bernal’s Black Athena; Gerald Horne’s Race War!; and Viet Thanh Nguyen’s Race and Resistance: Literature and Politics in Asian America as well as essays and articles by a number of scholars, some of which are included in this book. **The area of African American and Asian American intersections is wide and expanding and we welcome contributions to the topic.** There remain certain topics that have not been explored or need further investigation and discussion**, including black and Asian intersections in cuisine, clothing, lifestyle (child rearing, marriage), social life (dating, friendships, daily interactions), and more. There are also a number of social and historical interactions that need further research and analysis, including common experiences and interactions among the plantation societies throughout the nineteenth-century Americas;** black American responses to the anti-Asian movements that pervaded from the anti-Chinese agitation of the nineteenth century to the modern civil rights movement; Asian American responses to black American oppression prior to the 1960s; and African American response to U.S. imperialism in Asia. On the latter issue, a strong, militant, anti-imperialist tradition of African American opposition to U.S. imperialism in Asia has existed since the Spanish-American War of 1898, beginning with African American news- papers’ opposition to American colonization of the Philippines. W. E. B. Du Bois and Paul Robeson fiercely denounced U.S. intervention in Korea. And the U.S. anti-Vietnam War movement included a broad African American involvement, including not only radical anti-imperialist leaders and organizations of the black Left but also mainstream civil rights leaders and organizations such as Ralph Abernathy, Dick Gregory, and Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., who in April of 1967 declared his total opposition to the war in Southeast Asia, supported draft resistance, and targeted the U.S. government as ‘‘the greatest purveyor of violence in the world today.’’ African American opposition to the U.S. war in Southeast Asia moved the ‘‘peace’’ movement to a position of anti-imperialism as the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) was led by Stokely Carmichael in a chant of ‘‘Hell no, we won’t go!’’ at a United Nations demonstration in 1967. African Americans were at the forefront of the early antiwar movement. The activist-attorney Conrad Lynn was the leading advisor and counsel to youth fighting induction into the U.S. army. ‘‘In 1965, the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party issued the first organizational opposition to President Johnson’s escalation of the war, rejecting ‘fighting in Vietnam for the White Man’s Freedom’ and urging black men ‘to not honor the draft here in Mississippi.’ ’’ In 1966, SNCC became the first national U.S. organization to come out against the war. ‘‘For endorsing this stand, Julian Bond, duly elected to the Georgia legislature, was denied his seat (later restored by the Supreme Court). Also in 1965, Freedomways, the first national magazine to denounce the war, editorially labeling it ‘racist’ in origin and intent, became the fountainhead of a black anti-war position.’’ **By 1969, massive African American opposition to the war was reflected in the pronouncement by every major civil rights organization of the time (with the notable exception of the NAACP) that American policy in Asia was a reflection and continuation of American racism at home. African American opposition to U.S. Asian policy was highly dramatized by the slogan ‘‘No Vietnamese ever called me ~~nigger~~,’’ with its most dramatic adoption by world heavyweight boxing champion Muhammad Ali in his refusal to be drafted.** Ali announced his refusal to be drafted into the army of a country that ‘‘continue[s] the domination of white slavemasters over the dark people the world over.’’ A 1967 film produced/directed by David Loeb Weiss, en- titled No Vietnamese Ever Called Me ~~Nigger~~, documented growing black ur- ban community opposition toward the U.S. war in Southeast Asia. **Clearly, in all social struggles in the United States,** African American leaders and organizations have played a vanguard role and have provided a radical and anti-imperialist influence and impact. **Less recognized and examined has been the influence and impact of Asian cultural and political traditions, forms, and experiences upon African American developments. In our focus upon interconnectivity, collaboration, mutual influences, and inspirations, we assert and establish an alternative tradition of cross-cultural unity among oppressed peoples in the United States (and in the Western Hemisphere).** We consider our anthology to be a beginning contribution to survey the political and cultural connections developed by peoples in the African and Asian diasporas in confronting white supremacy and national oppression.

### OBSERVATION TWO: THE RACIALIZED FRAMING OF DIPLOMATIC ENGAGEMENT

WE CALL TO AFFIRM AFRO ASIA AS A DISCURSIVE METHOD OF UNITING THE BLACK AND ASIATIC WORLDS IN THE COLLECTIVE RESISTANCE AGAINST WHITE SUPREMACY.

Afro Asia is an attempt to confront the LOST IDENTITIES construed by WHITE SURPEMACY and MAKE VISIBILE the global exportation of anti-black violence and orientalism across the global sphere. It is the CONVERSATION and INTELLECTUAL DISCUSSIONS that are had on the way that white supremacy has masked the true engagement of blacks and Asians in the modern world. Afro Asia is a way to think about RACE DIFFERENTLY—a way to make VISIBLE the ALLIANCE over the SILENCED discussion of shared resistance.

Afro Asia allows reclamation of the interconnected revolutionary form of liberation that broadens the anti-racist and anti-imperialistic movements between the blacks of the U.S. and the Chinese.

**The 1AC methodology exposes the INDIFFERENCES from the LINKAGES, CONECTIONS, and CROSS-CULTURE INTERACTIONS, to the COMPLEXITIES, CONTRADICTIONS, and CONFLICT between black and Asian individuals in the United States. The 1AC’s dialectical insertion of Afro-Asian scholarship creates a framework of diplomatic engagement where we can ANALYZE the systemic causes for these political complexities presented by the resolution under the manipulation of RACE and NATIONALIST DIVISIONS.**

Mullen & Ho 08 [Bill V. Mullen is the Professor of English and American Studies @ Purdue and teaches courses in African American Literature and Culture; Fred Ho is a political activist and the founder and bandleader of the Afro Asian Music Ensemble; Afro Asia: Revolutionary Political and Cultural Connections between African Americans and Asian Americans, pp. 2-5; REJ]

Fred himself came of age during the late 1960s and early 1970s, and he claims that his identity as Asian/Chinese American was ignited by the upsurge of the Black Power movement in the United States. It was reading Malcolm X’s Autobiography while being singled out for racial harassment in public school that forged his own sense of mutually shared oppressions. Like many other United States activists of color, Ho first came to an affirmation of ethnic identity from the inspiration and impact of radical and revolutionary African American politics and culture. This discovery brought with it, however, a far larger challenge: namely, a way to enact, analyze, and catalyze a radical and revolutionary political and cultural stance grounded in anti-imperialism and anti-oppression and devoid of Eurocentric and white supremacist reference and ideals. For Ho, and for other authors in this book, Afro Asia is a strategic intersection for thinking through an internationalist, global paradigm that joins the world’s two largest continents and populations, as well as an anti-imperialist, insurgent identity that is no longer majority white in orientation. Afro Asia, that is, is the imperative to imagine a ‘‘new world’’ grounded upon two great ancient worlds as well as a radical and revolutionary anti-imperialist tradition. It is a tradition with long roots, one that includes and links W. E. B. DuBois, Ho Chi Minh, Mao Zedong, Malcolm X, Robert F. Williams, the Black Panthers, the Asian Pacific American movement, Yuri Kochiyama, Ishmael Reed, Frank Chin, and Maxine Hong Kingston, to name just a few. These figures give a name and voice to their international counterparts in the black and Asiatic worlds, and they have for two centuries sustained a tradition of collaborative radical political and cultural connections heretofore undocumented in the literature of the West. From the earliest days of the United States, Africans and Asians in the Americas have been linked in a shared tradition of resistance to class and racial exploitation and oppression. With the formal abolition of African slavery arose the Asiatic ‘‘coolie’’ (or contract labor) trade that brought Asian laborers, often on the very same ships that transported captured Africans, to the very same plantation societies in the West. In this common and often overlapping diasporic experience, shared traditions of resistance and struggle have developed for liberation and equality. African Americans and Asian Americans have mutually influenced, borrowed from, and jointly innovated new forms in culture (from music to cuisine to clothing) and politics (from shared movement ideologies to organizations). This intersecting ground of cultural borrowing and exchange has been partly documented by classicists engaged by questions of the relationship between Greek and Rome on the one hand, and the larger realm of the contemporary Middle East, from North Africa to the Mediterranean, on the other. Among the early pioneers in this work was the African American classicist Frank Snowden. His books, Before Color Prejudice: The Ancient View of Blacks and Blacks in Antiquity and Ethiopians in the Greco-Roman Experience, describe the influences on Western art, literature, and design of North African societies in particular. Snowden’s work sits squarely in the tradition of the Classics. Martin Bernal’s influential multivolume book Black Athena provides a polemical cultural studies framework for under- standing the influence of North African and Mediterranean influence on Greco-Roman culture as a story of racist historiography extending to eighteenth- and nineteenth-century European scholars’ efforts to downplay or eradicate the Afro Asian role in the production of Western culture. Wilson Moses, in his book Afrotopia, provides his own historiography for this debate, noting that nineteenth-century Afrocentrists and Egyptocentrists in the United States likewise struggled to make visible the influences of African thought and culture on antiquity debates. Later, G. M. James’s Stolen Legacy gave a name to the accusations of cultural ‘‘pirating’’ described by Bernal, an argument that W. E. B. Du Bois also made vigorously in his chapter ‘‘Asia in Africa’’ in the expanded edition of his book The World and Africa, first published in 1946. DuBois’s own large body of writing on Asian politics and history is perhaps the most overlooked legacy of his capacious intellectual career and a sign of the ethnocentrism that has constrained the analysis of Afro Asian exchange. Indeed, the publication of Vijay Prashad’s two important books The Karma of Brown Folk and Everybody Was Kung-Fu Fighting helped to reanimate attention to Afro Asian intersections. Prashad used the term ‘polyculturalism’ to characterize the long, repressed but vital tradition of Afro Asian encounter and exchange, particularly among the working classes. While the focus of this anthology is likewise on shared and common struggles as well as the linkages, connections, cross-cultural borrowing, and mutual solidarity, it is important to recognize the complexities, contradictions, and conflicts between black and Asian peoples in the United States. It is also important to provide a proper framework and analysis of the systemic causes for such complexities as well as the political function served by the manipulation of race, the promotion of nationalist divisions and rivalries, and the inculcation of mutually pervasive stereotypes and racial jealousies. Indeed, DuBois himself was perhaps the first to recognize the nefariousness of these divisions and misunderstandings. For example, in his 1935 essay ‘‘Indians and American Negroes’’ DuBois complained that black Americans were provided almost no information on Asia, especially India, and thus had no context for seeing their own racial struggles in the necessary context of anticolonialism. Likewise, South Asians, fed a steady Western diet of imperialist rhetoric, were absent a positive understanding of African Americans and Africans. DuBois’s ability to recognize this dual orientalism capable of dismantling and forestalling Afro Asian unity also illuminates the work done by the scholars Reginald Kearney and Mark Gallichio. They note that during the 1930s and 1940s subgroups of black Americans, primarily from the working classes, were drawn to Afro Asian solidarity and even infatuation with Japanese imperialism as an imaginative means of cross-racial alliance. Gerald Horne, in his impressive book Race War! White Supremacy and the Japanese Attack on the British Empire, situates these desires and at times misunderstandings within the broad context of white supremacy. Horne argues that the importation of British and U.S. forms of racial supremacy across the Pan-Pacific region came home to roost both in the racial supremacist rhetoric undergirding Japanese imperialism during the 1930s as well as in the various nationalist, cross-nationalist, and otherwise anti-racist Afro Asian dreams of alliance. Put simply, race, racism, and capitalism have conspired, according to Horne, to both produce and manipulate the black world’s understanding of Asia and the Asian world’s understanding of the black ‘‘West.’’ And yet the dominant form of black-Asian alliance across the twentieth century is a carefully considered strategic anti-essentialism rooted in analysis of political, economic, and racial conditions across the colored world produced under white supremacy. This is the clear legacy of the so-called Bandung era of 1955 to 1973 that arguably countered and corrected many of the advances made in the Afro Asian solidarity movements of the 1930s by linking them to emergent anticolonial struggles around the world. Richard Wright understood this movement well when he traveled from Paris to Bandung, Indonesia, in 1955 to attend the Afro Asian meeting of twenty- nine decolonizing heads of state. His book on the event, The Color Curtain, is itself a contradictory example of Afro Asia’s themes: a vigorous support for anticolonial solidarity, an indictment of white supremacy, a cry to the wretched of the earth, and yet an oddly anti-Communist and at times orientalist rendering of his own dislocation from both the ‘Eastern’ and ‘Western’ worlds during his American exile. Bandung informs and haunts any and all efforts to theorize Afro Asia. It is both the watershed and high-water mark of black-Asian affiliation and the unfinished and imperfect dream of a road still being pursued and paved by the authors represented in this book.

**AFRO ASIA is a discursive method that allows us to CHALLENGE white supremacy. As anti-blackness and orientalism have transcended borders, white supremacy has similarly become a GLOBAL paradigm and an INSIDIOUS UNNAMED political system that guides the modern world. It is not seen as political, yet serves as the background against which other systems we see as political are highlighted. The diplomatic engagement through Afro Asia is a discursive method that allows us to challenge the global philosophy of white supremacy.**

**What is needed is a GLOBAL THEORETICAL framework for situating discussion of race and white racism that CHALLENGE the GLOBAL white political philosophy, beyond borders. We must recognize the POLITICAL SYSTEM of WHITE SUPREMACY.**

Mills 97 [Charles Mills is a Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy @ Northwestern University, *Racial Contract*]

White supremacy is the unnamed political system that has made the modern world what it is today. You will not find this term in introductory, or even advanced, texts in political theory. A standard undergraduate philosophy course will start off with Plato and Aristotle, perhaps say something about Augustine, Aquinas, and Machiavelli, move on to Hobbes, Locke, Mill, and Marx, and then wind up with Rawls and Nozick. It will introduce you to notions of aristocracy, democracy, absolutism, liberalism, representative government, socialism, welfare capitalism, and libertarianism. But though it covers more than two thousand years of Western political thought and runs the ostensible gamut of political systems, there will be no mention of the basic political system that has shaped the world for the past several hundred years. And this omission is not accidental. Rather, it reflects the fact that standard textbooks and courses have for the most part been written and designed by whites, who take their racial privilege so much for granted that they do not even see it as political, as a form of domination. Ironically, the most important political system of recent global history-the system of domination by which white people have historically ruled over and, in certain important ways, continue to rule over nonwhite people-is not seen as a political system at all. It is just taken for granted; it is the background against which other systems, which we are to see as political are highlighted. This book is an attempt to redirect your vision, to make you see what, in a sense, has been there all along. Philosophy has remained remarkably untouched by the debates over multiculturalism, canon reform, and ethnic diversity racking the academy; both demographically and conceptually, it is one of the "whitest" of the humanities. Blacks, for example, constitute only about 1 percent of philosophers in North American universities-a hundred or so people out of more than ten thousand-and there are even fewer Latino, Asian American, and Native American philosophers! Surely this underrepresentation itself stands in need of an explanation, and in my opinion it can be traced in part to a conceptual array and a standard repertoire of concerns whose abstractness typically elides, rather than genuinely includes, the experience of racial minorities. Since (white) women have the demographic advantage of numbers, there are of course far more female philosophers in the profession than nonwhite philosophers (though still not proportionate to women's percentage of the population), and they have made far greater progress in developing alternative conceptualizations. Those African American philosophers who do work in moral and political theory tend either to produce general work indistinguishable from that of their white peers or to focus on local issues (affirmative action, the black "underclass") or historical figures (W. E. B. Du Bois, Alain Locke) in a way that does not aggressively engage the broader debate. What is needed is a global theoretical framework for situating discussions of race and white racism, and thereby challenging the assumptions of white political philosophy, which would correspond to feminist theorists' articulation of the centrality of gender, patriarchy, and sexism to traditional moral and political theory. What is needed, in other words, is a recognition that racism (or, as I will argue, global white supremacy) is itself a political system, a particular power structure of formal or informal rule, socioeconomic privilege, and norms for the differential distribution of material wealth and opportunities, benefits and burdens, rights and duties. The notion of the Racial Contract is, I suggest, one possible way of making this connection with mainstream theory, since it uses the vocabulary and apparatus already developed for contractarianism to map this unacknowledged system. Contract talk is, after all, the political lingua franca of our times.

As federal and state government policies further perpetuate the exclusion of black and Asian bodies, the mass media EXPLOITS, SENSATIONALIZES and CONSTRUCTS black-Asian conflicts in the purpose of VICTIMS BLAMING VICTIMS and allowing white supremacy to thrive. The method of the 1AC allows a reclamation of diplomatic engagement that allows an effective challenge to white supremacy.

Mullen & Ho 08 [Bill V. Mullen is the Professor of English and American Studies @ Purdue and teaches courses in African American Literature and Culture; Fred Ho is a political activist and the founder and bandleader of the Afro Asian Music Ensemble; Afro Asia: Revolutionary Political and Cultural Connections between African Americans and Asian Americans, pp. 9-10; REJ]

In part, the mass media has exploited and sensationalized these conflicts. Some critics would argue that the corporate mass media has actually created a conflict when there really is none. The so-called ‘‘black-Korean’’ or ‘‘black- Asian’’ conflict seems no more or no less a phenomenon than the ongoing, historical ‘‘black-white’’ conflict or the ‘‘black-brown’’ conflict. The special attention given to the black-Asian conflict seems to serve the purpose of victims blaming victims and letting white supremacy off the hook. The issues of bank redlining, the maldistribution of social services and resources, police brutality, narcotics trafficking, and impoverished education are conveniently deferred for sensationalistic headlines about black-Asian violence and altercations. However, the social context for such conflicts are a result of the greater inequality and impoverishment contributed by federal and state government policies that have ushered in a major withdrawal and abandonment of support services and funding to the inner city, the elimination and rescinding of welfare benefits, and the shrinking investments into urban improvement—all of which are born most unduly and harshly by African Americans as well as Latinos. Beginning with the withdrawal of U.S. forces in Southeast Asia, U.S. government policies favored the repatriation of powerful and wealthy anti-Communist allies in Asia. Additionally, Pacific Rim overseas capital investments drastically increased in inner-city areas along with the particular phenomenon of newer Asian immigrants investing their entire family savings into small businesses, most commonly liquor stores, greengrocers, cleaners, and other mercantile enterprises. The longstanding obstacles and difficulties to African American capital expansion are well documented, ranging from practices and policies of bank redlining (i.e., not granting capital loans), to corporate franchise monopolization (e.g., a big corporate chain muscling out smaller local businesses), and lack of adequate financial and managerial services. Certain African Americans resent and are angry at perceived Asian economic success. ‘‘They just come in, start up their businesses, take our money, and give nothing back except disrespect’’ is the all-too-common attitude in the black community toward the Asian ‘outsiders.’ The Asian new immigrant entrepreneurs sometimes have an attitude of indifference and harshness toward their low-income black clientele, along with a limited English-language ability and a lack of historical understanding of U.S. racism. To their credit, certain black nationalist protestors (such as those in the December 12th movement) have distinguished between specifically criticizing Korean capitalists and have opposed a general anti-Asian position. And there is no doubt that some newer Asian immigrants (not just the merchants) hold racist attitudes that are greatly influenced by overall U.S. white racism and stereotypes toward black people. Whatever the racist incident, by an Asian committed upon Africans or by an African committed upon Asians, media attention never focuses on collaborative attempts to protest and condemn the racism. Given the ‘‘low and narrow’’ consciousness between blacks and Asians as a reflection of the weakness and ebb of the black liberation movement and the Asian movement respectively, increasing incidents, conflicts, and flare-ups will occur.

**Racism makes all forms of violence inevitable, it must be rejected in every instance.**

Memmi 2k [Albert Memmi is a Professor Emeritus of Sociology @ University Of Paris, *Racism*, translated by Steve Martinot, pg.163-165]

The struggle against racism will be long, difficult, without intermission, without remission, probably never achieved. Yet, for this very reason, it is a struggle to be undertaken without surcease and without concessions. One cannot be indulgent toward racism; one must not even let the monster in the house, especially not in a mask. To give it merely a foothold means to augment the bestial part in us and in other people, which is to diminish what is human. To accept the racist universe to the slightest degree is to endorse fear, injustice, and violence. It is to accept the persistence of the dark history in which we still largely live. it is to agree that the outsider will always be a possible victim (and which man is not himself an outsider relative to someone else?. Racism illustrates, in sum, the inevitable negativity of the condition of the dominated that is, it illuminates in a certain sense the entire human condition. The anti-racist struggle, difficult though it is, and always in question, is nevertheless one of the prologues to the ultimate passage from animosity to humanity. In that sense, we cannot fail to rise to the racist challenge. However, it remains true that one’s moral conduit only emerges from a choice: one has to want it. It is a choice among other choices, and always debatable in its foundations and its consequences. Let us say, broadly speaking, that the choice to conduct oneself morally is the condition for the establishment of a human order, for which racism is the very negation. This is almost a redundancy. One cannot found a moral order, let alone a legislative order, on racism, because racism signifies the exclusion of the other, and his or her subjection to violence and domination. From an ethical point of view, if one can deploy a little religious language, racism is ‘the truly capital sin. It is not an accident that almost all of humanity’s spiritual traditions counsels respect for the weak, for orphans, widows, or strangers. It is not just a question of theoretical morality and disinterested commandments. Such unanimity in the safeguarding of the other suggests the real utility of such sentiments. All things considered, we have an interest in banishing injustice, because injustice engenders violence and death. Of course, this is debatable. There are those who think that if one is strong enough, the assault on and oppression of others is permissible. Bur no one is ever sure of remaining the strongest. One day, perhaps, the roles will be reversed. All unjust society contains within itself the seeds of its own death. It is probably smarter to treat others with respect so that they treat you with respect. “Recall.” says the Bible, “that you were once a stranger in Egypt,” which means both that you ought to respect the stranger because you were a stranger yourself and that you risk becoming one again someday. It is an ethical and a practical appeal—indeed, it is a contract, however implicit it might be. In short, the refusal of racism is the condition for all theoretical and practical morality because, in the end, the ethical choice commands the political choice, a just society must be a society accepted by all. If this contractual principle is not accepted, then only conflict, violence, and destruction will be our lot. If it is accepted, we can hope someday to live in peace. True, it is a wager, but the stakes are irresistible.

**AFRO ASIA preserves and promotes critical thinking of and ACTIVISM in a global culture, creating a liberation praxis that challenge the perceived permanence of manufactured distrust and division that allows for TRUE diplomatic engagement.**

**Before enacting calls to action we must have the prior discussions in debate that teach us how to develop the vocabularies by which we understand racism in order to have insightful conversations.**

**Davis 16** [Angela; Professor emerita @ UC Santa Cruz, political activist, scholar, author, and speaker. She is an outspoken advocate for the oppressed and exploited, writing on Black Liberation, women’s liberation, prison abolition, and international solidarity with Palestine. She was a former member of the Black Panther Party and one of the most celebrated female figures in the struggle for Civil Rights and Black Power; “Freedom is a Constant Struggle: Ferguson, Palestine, and the Foundations of a Movement;” Chpt. 7: “The Truth Telling Project: Violence in America” Speech given in St. Louis, Missouri (June 27, 2015); pp. 87-90]

In this context **I want to take issue with one of Obama’s points in his quite amazing eulogy of Reverend Clementa Pinckney** in Charleston, South Carolina, yesterday. **I want to take issue with what he said when he exclaimed that if we want to be successful in our struggle against racism we cannot say that we need more conversations about race. Rather we should say that we need action**. Certainly we need a great deal more than talk, but it is also the case that we need to learn how to talk about race and racism. If we do not know how to meaningfully talk about racism, our actions will move in misleading directions. **The call for public conversations on race and racism is also a call to develop a vocabulary that permits us to have insightful conversations**. **If we attempt to use historically obsolete vocabularies, our consciousness of racism will remain shallow and we can be easily urged to assume that, for example, changes in the law spontaneously produce effective changes in the social world**. For example, **those who assume that because slavery was legally abolished in the nineteenth century, it was thereby relegated to the dustbin of history, fail to recognize the extent to which cultural and structural elements of slavery are still with us**. The prison-industrial complex furnishes numerous examples of the persistence of slavery. There are those who believe that we have definitively triumphed in the struggle for civil rights. However, vast numbers of Black people are still deprived of the right to vote-especially if they are in prison or former felons. Moreover, even those who did acquire rights that were not previously available to them did not thereby achieve jobs, education, housing, and health care. **The** mid-twentieth-century **campaign for civil rights was an essential moment in our struggle for racial equality, but it is important to develop vocabularies that help us acknowledge that civil rights was and is not the entire story.** Such an analysis of racism would be helpful to those who are celebrating yesterday’s Supreme Court decision on marriage equality as if the final barrier to justice for LGBTQ communities had been surmounted. The decision was indeed historic, but the struggles against homophobic state violence, [for] economic rights, health care, et cetera, continue. Most importantly if the intersectionality of struggles against racism, homophobia, and transphobia is minimized, we will never achieve significant victories in our fight for justice. This is yet another reason why **it is essential to develop richer and more critical vocabularies with which to express our insights about racism. The inability to understand the complexity of racism can lead to assumptions, for example, that there is an independent phenomenon we can call “Black-on-Black crime” that has nothing to do with racism. So, the development of new ways of thinking about racism requires us not only to understand economic, social, and ideological structures, but also collective psychic structures**. One of the major examples of the violence of racism consists of the rearing of generations of Black people who have not learned how to imagine the future-who are not now in possession of the education and the imagination that allows them to envision the future. This is violence that leads to other forms of violence-violence against children; violence against partners; violence against friends…in our families and communities, we often unconsciously continue the work of larger forces of racism, assuming that this violence is individual and sui generis. **If the popularization of more complex analyses of racism**, especially those that have been developed in the context of Black and women-of-color feminisms, **can assist us to understand how deeply embedded racist violence [is] in our country’s economic and ideological structures, these ways of talking about racism can help us to grasp the global reach of our struggles.**  Palestinian-Americans’ involvement in the Ferguson protests was complemented by expressions of solidarity with Ferguson from Palestinian activists in the West Bank and Gaza. The Ferguson struggle has taught us that local issues have global ramifications. The militarization of the Ferguson police and the advice tweeted by Palestinian activists helped to recognize our political kinship with the boycott, divestment, and sanctions movement and with the larger struggle for justice in Palestine. Moreover, we have come to understand the central role Islamophobia has played in the emergence of new forms of racism in the aftermath of September 11, 2001. **Deep understandings of racist violence arm us against deceptive solutions. When we are told that we simply need better police and better prisons, we counter with what we really need. We need to reimagine security, which will involve the abolition of policing and imprisonment was we know them. We will say demilitarize the police, disarm the police, abolish the institution of the police as we know it, and abolish imprisonment as the dominant mode of punishment. But we will have only just begun to tell the truth about violence in America.**
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### 1. The limits of anti-racism by Adolph Reed Jr.

CITE-- Adolph Reed Jr. Adolph L. Reed, Jr. is a professor of political science at the University of Pennsylvania, specializing in race and American politics. The following article appeared in Left Business Observer #121, September 2009. Copyright 2009, Left Business Observer. http://www.leftbusinessobserver.com/Antiracism.html

Antiracism is a favorite concept on the American left these days. Of course, all good sorts want to be against racism, but what does the word mean exactly?

The contemporary discourse of “antiracism” is focused much more on taxonomy than politics. It emphasizes the name by which we should call some strains of inequality—whether they should be broadly recognized as evidence of “racism”— over specifying the mechanisms that produce them or even the steps that can be taken to combat them. And, no, neither “overcoming racism” nor “rejecting whiteness” qualifies as such a step any more than does waiting for the “revolution” or urging God’s heavenly intervention. If organizing a rally against racism seems at present to be a more substantive political act than attending a prayer vigil for world peace, that’s only because contemporary antiracist activists understand themselves to be employing the same tactics and pursuing the same ends as their predecessors in the period of high insurgency in the struggle against racial segregation.

This view, however, is mistaken. The postwar activism that reached its crescendo in the South as the “civil rights movement” wasn’t a movement against a generic “racism;” it was specifically and explicitly directed toward full citizenship rights for black Americans and against the system of racial segregation that defined a specific regime of explicitly racial subordination in the South. The 1940s March on Washington Movement was also directed against specific targets, like employment discrimination in defense production. Black Power era and post-Black Power era struggles similarly focused on combating specific inequalities and pursuing specific goals like the effective exercise of voting rights and specific programs of redistribution.

Clarity lost

Whether or not one considers those goals correct or appropriate, they were clear and strategic in a way that “antiracism” simply is not. Sure, those earlier struggles relied on a discourse of racial justice, but their targets were concrete and strategic. It is only in a period of political demobilization that the historical specificities of those struggles have become smoothed out of sight in a romantic idealism that homogenizes them into timeless abstractions like “the black liberation movement”—an entity that, like Brigadoon, sporadically appears and returns impelled by its own logic.

Ironically, as the basis for a politics, antiracism seems to reflect, several generations downstream, the victory of the postwar psychologists in depoliticizing the critique of racial injustice by shifting its focus from the social structures that generate and reproduce racial inequality to an ultimately individual, and ahistorical, domain of “prejudice” or “intolerance.” (No doubt this shift was partly aided by political imperatives associated with the Cold War and domestic anticommunism.) Beryl Satter’s recent book on the racialized political economy of “contract buying” in Chicago in the 1950s and 1960s, Family Properties: Race, Real Estate, and the Exploitation of Black Urban America, is a good illustration of how these processes worked; Robert Self’s book on Oakland since the 1930s, American Babylon, is another. Both make abundantly clear the role of the real estate industry in creating and recreating housing segregation and ghettoization.

Tasty bunny

All too often, “racism” is the subject of sentences that imply intentional activity or is characterized as an autonomous “force.” In this kind of formulation, “racism,” a conceptual abstraction, is imagined as a material entity. Abstractions can be useful, but they shouldn’t be given independent life.

I can appreciate such formulations as transient political rhetoric; hyperbolic claims made in order to draw attention and galvanize opinion against some particular injustice. But as the basis for social interpretation, and particularly interpretation directed toward strategic political action, they are useless. Their principal function is to feel good and tastily righteous in the mouths of those who propound them. People do things that reproduce patterns of racialized inequality, sometimes with self-consciously bigoted motives, sometimes not. Properly speaking, however, “racism” itself doesn’t do anything more than the Easter Bunny does.

Yes, racism exists, as a conceptual condensation of practices and ideas that reproduce, or seek to reproduce, hierarchy along lines defined by race. Apostles of antiracism frequently can’t hear this sort of statement, because in their exceedingly simplistic version of the nexus of race and injustice there can be only the Manichean dichotomy of those who admit racism’s existence and those who deny it. There can be only Todd Gitlin (the sociologist and former SDS leader who has become, both fairly and as caricature, the symbol of a “class-first” line) and their own heroic, truth-telling selves, and whoever is not the latter must be the former. Thus the logic of straining to assign guilt by association substitutes for argument.

My position is—and I can’t count the number of times I’ve said this bluntly, yet to no avail, in response to those in blissful thrall of the comforting Manicheanism—that of course racism persists, in all the disparate, often unrelated kinds of social relations and “attitudes” that are characteristically lumped together under that rubric, but from the standpoint of trying to figure out how to combat even what most of us would agree is racial inequality and injustice, that acknowledgement and $2.25 will get me a ride on the subway. It doesn’t lend itself to any particular action except more taxonomic argument about what counts as racism.

Do what now?

And here’s a practical catch-22. In the logic of antiracism, exposure of the racial element of an instance of wrongdoing will lead to recognition of injustice, which in turn will lead to remedial action—though not much attention seems ever given to how this part is supposed to work. I suspect this is because the exposure part, which feels so righteously yet undemandingly good, is the real focus. But this exposure convinces only those who are already disposed to recognize.

Those who aren’t so disposed have multiple layers of obfuscating ideology, mainly forms of victim-blaming, through which to deny that a given disparity stems from racism or for that matter is even unjust. The Simi Valley jury’s reaction to the Rodney King tape, which saw King as perp and the cops as victims, is a classic illustration. So is “underclass” discourse. Victimization by subprime mortgage scams can be, and frequently is, dismissed as the fault of irresponsible poor folks aspiring beyond their means. And there is no shortage of black people in the public eye—Bill Cosby and Oprah Winfrey are two prime examples, as is Barack Obama—who embrace and recycle those narratives of poor black Americans’ wayward behavior and self-destructive habits.

And how does a simple narrative of “racism” account for the fact that so many black institutions, including churches and some racial advocacy organizations, and many, many black individuals actively promoted those risky mortgages as making the “American Dream of home ownership” possible for “us”? Sure, there are analogies available—black slave traders, slave snitches, “Uncle Toms” and various race traitors—but those analogies are moral judgments, not explanations. And to mention them only opens up another second-order debate about racial authenticity—about who “really” represents the black community. Even Clarence Thomas sees himself as a proud black man representing the race’s best interests.

My point is that it’s more effective politically to challenge the inequality and injustice directly and bypass the debate over whether it should be called “racism.”

I do recognize that, partly because of the terms on which the civil rights movement’s victories have been achieved, there is a strong practical imperative for stressing the racially invidious aspects of injustices: they have legal remedies. Race is one of the legal classes protected by anti-discrimination law; poverty, for instance, is not. But this makes identifying “racism” a technical requirement for pursuing certain grievances, not the basis of an overall political strategy for pursuit of racial justice, or, as I believe is a clearer left formulation, racial equality as an essential component of a program of social justice.

Anti-Marx

I’ve been struck by the level of visceral and vitriolic anti-Marxism I’ve seen from this strain of defenders of antiracism as a politics. It’s not clear to me what drives it because it takes the form of snide dismissals than direct arguments. Moreover, the dismissals typically include empty acknowledgment that “of course we should oppose capitalism,” whatever that might mean. In any event, the tenor of this anti-Marxism is reminiscent of those right-wing discourses, many of which masqueraded as liberal, in which only invoking the word “Marxism” was sufficient to dismiss an opposing argument or position.

This anti-Marxism has some curious effects. Leading professional antiracist Tim Wise came to the defense of Obama’s purged green jobs czar Van Jones by dismissing Jones’s “brief stint with a pseudo-Maoist group,” and pointing instead to “his more recent break with such groups and philosophies, in favor of a commitment to eco-friendly, sustainable capitalism.” In fact, Jones was a core member of a revolutionary organization, STORM, that took itself very seriously, almost comically so.

And are we to applaud his break with radical politics in favor of a style of capitalism that few actual capitalists embrace? This is the substance of Wise’s defense.

This sort of thing only deepens my suspicions about antiracism’s status within the comfort zone of neoliberalism’s discourses of “reform.” More to the point, I suspect as well that this vitriol toward radicalism is rooted partly in the conviction that a left politics based on class analysis and one focused on racial injustice are Manichean alternatives.

Devolutions

This is also a notion of fairly recent provenance, in part as well another artifact of the terms on which the civil rights victories were consolidated, including the emergence of a fully incorporated black political class in the 1970s and its subsequent evolution. By contrast, examining, for example, the contributions to historian and civil rights activist Rayford Logan’s 1944 volume What the Negro Wants, one sees quite a different picture. Nearly all the contributors—including nominal conservatives—to this collection of analyses from a broad cross section of black scholars and activists asserted in very concrete terms that the struggle for racial justice and the general struggle for social and industrial democracy were more than inseparable, that the victory of the former largely depended on the success of the latter. This was, at the time, barely even a matter for debate: rather, it was the frame of reference for any black mass politics and protest activity.

As I suggest above, various pressures of the postwar period—including carrots of success and sticks of intimidation and witch-hunting, as well as the articulation of class tensions within the Civil Rights movement itself—drove an evolution away from this perspective and toward reformulation of the movement’s goals along lines more consonant with postwar, post-New Deal, Cold War liberalism. Thus what the political scientist Preston Smith calls “racial democracy” came gradually to replace social democracy as a political goal—the redress of grievances that could be construed as specifically racial took precedence over the redistribution of wealth, and an individualized psychology replaced notions of reworking the material sphere. This dynamic intensified with the combination of popular demobilization in black politics and emergence of the post-segregation black political class in the 1970s and 1980s.

We live under a regime now that is capable simultaneously of including black people and Latinos, even celebrating that inclusion as a fulfillment of democracy, while excluding poor people without a whimper of opposition. Of course, those most visible in the excluded class are disproportionately black and Latino, and that fact gives the lie to the celebration. Or does it really? From the standpoint of a neoliberal ideal of equality, in which classification by race, gender, sexual orientation or any other recognized ascriptive status (that is, status based on what one allegedly is rather than what one does) does not impose explicit, intrinsic or necessary limitations on one’s participation and aspirations in the society, this celebration of inclusion of blacks, Latinos and others is warranted.

We’ll be back!

But this notion of democracy is inadequate, since it doesn’t begin to address the deep and deepening patterns of inequality and injustice embedded in the ostensibly “neutral” dynamics of American capitalism. What A. Philip Randolph and others—even anticommunists like Roy Wilkins—understood in the 1940s is that what racism meant was that, so long as such dynamics persisted without challenge, black people and other similarly stigmatized populations would be clustered on the bad side of the distribution of costs and benefits. To extrapolate anachronistically to the present, they would have understood that the struggle against racial health disparities, for example, has no real chance of success apart from a struggle to eliminate for-profit health care.

These seem really transparent points to me, but maybe that’s just me. I remain curious why the “debate” over antiracism as a politics takes such indirect and evasive forms—like the analogizing and guilt by association, moralistic bombast in lieu of concrete argument—and why it persists in establishing, even often while denying the move, the terms of debate as race vs. class. I’m increasingly convinced that a likely reason is that the race line is itself a class line, one that is entirely consistent with the neoliberal redefinition of equality and democracy. It reflects the social position of those positioned to benefit from the view that the market is a just, effective, or even acceptable system for rewarding talent and virtue and punishing their opposites and that, therefore, removal of “artificial” impediments to its functioning like race and gender will make it even more efficient and just.

From this perspective even the “left” antiracist line that we must fight both economic inequality and racial inequality, which seems always in practice to give priority to “fighting racism” (often theorized as a necessary precondition for doing anything else), looks suspiciously like only another version of the evasive “we’ll come back for you” (after we do all the business-friendly stuff) politics that the Democrats have so successfully employed to avoid addressing economic injustice.

### 2. Marx, Race, & Neoliberalism by Reed Jr.
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